

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 1 through 3 and 5 through 16 are pending, with Claims 1, 9, and 10 being independent.

Applicants respectfully wish to advise the reference at page 7, line 5 of the July 25, 2007 Amendment to “1, 9, and 9” should have read --1, 9, and 10--. Favorable consideration is earnestly solicited.

The Official Action requires a new title. The title has been amended as required.

Claims 1, 2, 5 through 10, and 14 through 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over newly-cited U.S. Patent No. 6,452,632 B1 (Umeda, et al.). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Umeda, et al. in view of US 2002/0051071 A1 (Itano, et al.). Claims 11 through 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Umeda, et al. in view of Applicant’s allegedly admitted prior art (Fig. 8). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a pad for outputting the video signals (output by the amplifier) to an outside of the chip, the pad being arranged only along a side portion of the chip not parallel to the side portion along which the first shift register is arranged (the second shift register having a lower driving frequency).

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*, a pad for supplying a voltage to the amplifier (the amplifier outputting video signals), the pad being arranged only along a side portion of the chip not parallel to the side portion along which the first shift register is arranged (the second shift register having a lower driving frequency).

Claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, a pad for supplying a predetermined voltage or a ground voltage to an active element included in a pixel in the pixel region, the pad being arranged only along a side portion of the chip not parallel to the side portion along which

the first shift register is arranged (the second shift register having a lower driving frequency).

However, Applicants respectfully that none of Umeda, Itano, and Applicants' alleged admitted prior art, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, *arguendo*, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 9, and 10.

The Official Action appears to be taking the position that Umeda's Fig. 72 teaches a concrete circuit layout on a semiconductor chip, and that the layout therein is similar to that defined in the claims of the present application. This position is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that one having ordinary skill in the art in the field of semiconductor devices would have understood Umeda's Fig. 72 to merely be a block diagram *schematically* showing a concept of a solid state image sensor 501. Firstly, Applicants submit that Umeda's Fig. 72 is not described as showing a specific layout on a semiconductor chip. Secondly, Applicants submit that in Umeda's Fig. 72, components therein are connected mutually by arrows each indicating a signal flowing direction — if Fig. 72 showed the layout of circuit components, such arrow would not be used therein, in Applicants' view. Thirdly, a portion indicated by the Official Action as being one corresponding to the pad of the present invention is positioned at an edge of the solid state image sensor 501, and in general, one skilled in the art would not form the pad at an edge of the semiconductor chip; instead, the pad would be positioned inside of the edge of the chip as shown in Fig. 1 of the present application. Therefore, Applicants believe that, even in Umeda, the practical layout of circuit components of pads and shift registers or scanning sections on a semiconductor chip is different from that shown in Umeda's Fig. 72. Meanwhile, Applicants submit that the present invention defined in the claims is

characterized by a special layout of circuit components such as a pad, first and second shift registers, pixels and an amplifier constituting a solid state image pick-up device on the semiconductor chip, etc., and cannot be anticipated or suggested by Umeda's Fig. 72, which is merely a block diagram schematically showing a concept of a solid state image sensor.

Applicants further respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed features as recited, *inter alia*, in Claims 1, 9, and 10.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel S. Glueck/
Daniel S. Glueck
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/mcm

FOHS_WS 1716311v1